

REMARKS

Applicants would like to point out an inconsistency in the Office Action. In the Summary of the Office Action in the Disposition of Claims, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 1, 2, 11, 12 and 19-33 have been rejected. However, on Page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 1, 2, and 19-22 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's finding of the allowable condition of Claims 1-2 and 19-22 and would like to request a new Summary of the Office Action correcting these inconsistencies.

New Claims 34-38 have been added. No additional fees should be incurred by the addition of the new claims. Claims 34-38 are dependent on Claim 1 which the Examiner has indicated is in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that Claims 34-38 are in condition for allowance and no examination of these claims is required.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 23 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree. Figure 10 shows that the

front half module has a contact running along a length of the channeling formed in the substrate as claimed in Claim 23. This is described on page 10, lines 13-16 wherein the specification states that "Located in the channeling 108 is an edge connector 120. The edge connector 120 is electrically connected to the integrated circuit dies. The edge connector 120 is electrically connected to the circuit dies by conductive patterns within the substrate or by wire bonds." Figure 11 shows the front half module comprises a substrate having at least one die coupled thereto, the tab member formed in the substrate as claimed in Claim 29. This is described on page 11, lines 10-13 wherein the specification states that "the front half 102 has a tab member 126 extending out from a rear section of the front half 102. The tab member 126 will have a connector 128 coupled to a bottom section of the tab member 126. The connector 128 is electrically coupled to the integrated circuit dies of the front half 102."

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection of Claims 23 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph has been effectively traversed. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the patent application, Applicant has cancelled Claims 23 and 29.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ainsbury, U.S. Patent 5,513,074. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the patent application, Applicant has cancelled Claims 11 and 12 and all claims based on these claims.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' claimed invention is deserving of patent protection because it describes a useful and functioning apparatus which is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment Letter, in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, are fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that they have persuasively demonstrated that the above-identified Patent Application, including Claims 1-2, 19-22, and 34-38 are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

If the foregoing does not place the case in condition for

immediate allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned for purposes of a telephone interview.

If there are any fees incurred by this Amendment Letter, please deduct them from our Deposit Account NO. 23-0830.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey D. Moy
Reg. No. 39,307
Attorney for Applicants

Weiss, Moy & Harris, P.C.
4204 N. Brown Ave.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
(480) 994-8888 (Phone)
(480) 947-2663 (Fax)

JDM/msw